

REMARKS

1. We thank the examiner for allowing claims 59-61, 63-65, 69-96 (OA §4).

2. We have cancelled claim 66, so the enablement rejection stated in OA §3 is moot.

3. We have cancelled claim 62 and replaced it with new claim 97, in view of 1) the inconsistent use of underlining in the original claim, 2) the Examiner's concern with any use of underlining other than to indicate new text in an amended claim, and 3) the examiner's concern with the use of capitalization to differentiate D- and L-amino acids. This moots the indefiniteness rejection (OA §2).

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By: 

Iver P. Cooper
Reg. No. 28,005

624 Ninth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
Telephone: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile: (202) 737-3528
IPC:lms
G:\ipc\n-q\Plou\Ploug1\pto amend.wpd